

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

Jagoda Ison,	:	
	:	Civil Action No.: _____
Plaintiff,	:	
v.	:	
Delta Management Association, Inc.; and	:	
DOES 1-10, inclusive,	:	COMPLAINT
Defendants.	:	

For this Complaint, the Plaintiff, Jagoda Ison, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This action arises out of Defendants' repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. ("FDCPA"), and the invasions of Plaintiff's personal privacy by the Defendants and its agents in their illegal efforts to collect a consumer debt.
2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1337.
3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331(b), in that the Defendants transact business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

PARTIES

4. The Plaintiff, Jagoda Ison ("Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in Lexington, Kentucky, and is a "consumer" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).

5. The Defendant, Delta Management Association, Inc. (“Delta”), is a Massachusetts business entity with an address of 100 Everett Avenue, Suite 6, Chelsea, Massachusetts 02150, operating as a collection agency, and is a “debt collector” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

6. Does 1-10 (the “Collectors”) are individual collectors employed by Delta and whose identities are currently unknown to the Plaintiff. One or more of the Collectors may be joined as parties once their identities are disclosed through discovery.

7. Delta at all times acted by and through one or more of the Collectors.

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

A. The Debt

8. The Plaintiff incurred a financial obligation (the “Debt”) to a creditor (the “Creditor”) in connection with a student loan.

9. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes and which meets the definition of a “debt” under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

10. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to Delta for collection, or Delta was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.

11. The Defendants attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in “communications” as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

B. Delta Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

12. The Defendants called the Plaintiff numerous times per day.

13. The Defendants called the Plaintiff up to four (4) times per week, including weekends.

14. The Defendants used rude and abusive language while speaking to the Plaintiff.

15. The Defendants were very aggressive towards the Plaintiff over the phone in demanding payment of the Debt.

16. The Defendants sent a letter dated March 29, 2010, to the Plaintiff. The Plaintiff, having misplaced the letter, called the Defendants to request a copy of the correspondence.

17. In response to the Plaintiff's letter copy request, the Defendants stated that they do not have to send her another copy, and that she should approach her ex-husband for money in order to satisfy the Debt.

18. The Defendants threatened to garnish the Plaintiff's wages. To date, the Plaintiff's wages have not been garnished.

19. The Defendants called the Plaintiff at her place of employment and stated that they were calling from a federal government agency. The Defendants did not name the government agency.

C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages

20. The Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of the Defendants' unlawful conduct.

21. As a direct consequence of the Defendants' acts, practices and conduct, the Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

22. The Defendants' conduct was so outrageous in character, and so extreme in degree, as to go beyond all possible bounds of decency, and to be regarded as atrocious, and utterly intolerable in a civilized community.

COUNT I
VIOLATIONS OF THE FDCPA 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.

23. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

24. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(a)(1) in that Defendants contacted the Plaintiff at a place and during a time known to be inconvenient for the Plaintiff.

25. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(2) in that Defendants used profane and abusive language when speaking with the consumer.

26. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(6) in that Defendants placed calls to the Plaintiff without disclosing the identity of the debt collection agency.

27. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(1) in that Defendants falsely represented to the Plaintiff that it was affiliated with the United States or a government entity.

28. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(4) in that Defendants threatened the Plaintiff with garnishment if the Debt was not paid.

29. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10) in that Defendants employed false and deceptive means to collect a debt.

30. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendants' violations.

COUNT II
VIOLATION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT,
M.G.L. c. 93A § 2, et seq.

31. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

32. The Defendants employed unfair or deceptive acts to collect the Debt, in violation of M.G.L. c. 93A § 2.

33. Defendant's failure to comply with these provisions constitutes an unfair or deceptive act under M.G.L. c. 93A § 9 and, as such, the Plaintiff is entitled to double or treble damages plus reasonable attorney's fees.

COUNT III
INVASION OF PRIVACY BY INTRUSION UPON SECLUSION

34. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

35. The Restatement of Torts, Second, § 652(b) defines intrusion upon seclusion as, "One who intentionally intrudes...upon the solitude or seclusion of another, or his private affairs or concerns, is subject to liability to the other for invasion of privacy, if the intrusion would be highly offensive to a reasonable person."

36. Massachusetts further recognizes the Plaintiff's right to be free from invasions of privacy, thus Defendant violated Massachusetts state law.

37. The Defendant intentionally intruded upon Plaintiff's right to privacy by continually harassing the Plaintiff with numerous telephone calls.

38. The telephone calls made by Defendant to the Plaintiff were so persistent and repeated with such frequency as to be considered, "hounding the plaintiff," and, "a substantial

burden to her existence," thus satisfying the Restatement of Torts, Second, § 652(b) requirement for an invasion of privacy.

39. The conduct of the Defendant in engaging in the illegal collection activities resulted in multiple invasions of privacy in such a way as would be considered highly offensive to a reasonable person.

40. As a result of the intrusions and invasions, the Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages in an amount to be determined at trial from Defendant.

41. All acts of Defendant and its agents were committed with malice, intent, wantonness, and recklessness, and as such, Defendant is subject to punitive damages.

COUNT IV
INTENTIONAL INFILCTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

42. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein at length.

43. The acts, practices and conduct engaged in by the Defendants vis-à-vis the Plaintiff was so outrageous in character, and so extreme in degree, as to go beyond all possible bounds of decency, and to be regarded as atrocious, and utterly intolerable in a civilized community.

44. The foregoing conduct constitutes the tort of intentional infliction of emotional distress under the laws of the State of Massachusetts.

45. All acts of Defendants and the Collectors complained of herein were committed with malice, intent, wantonness, and recklessness, and as such, Defendants are subject to imposition of punitive damages.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendants:

1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against Defendants;
2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for each violation pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(2)(A) against Defendants;
3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) against Defendants;
4. Double or treble damages plus reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to M.G.L. c. 93A § 3(A);
5. Actual damages from Defendants for the all damages including emotional distress suffered as a result of the intentional, reckless, and/or negligent FDCPA violations and intentional, reckless, and/or negligent invasions of privacy in an amount to be determined at trial for the Plaintiff;
6. Punitive damages; and
7. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: August 30, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Sergei Lemberg

Sergei Lemberg (BBO# 650671)
LEMBERG & ASSOCIATES L.L.C.
1100 Summer Street, 3rd Floor
Stamford, CT 06905
Telephone: (203) 653-2250
Facsimile: (877) 795-3666
Attorneys for Plaintiff